IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:	)	
	)	
Joseph G. GATTO	)	Group Art Unit: *Unknown*
	)	
Serial No.: Continuation of	)	
U.S. Serial No. 09/722,050	)	Examiner: *Unknown*
	)	
Filed: October 22, 2001	)	

For: SECURITY ANALYST ESTIMATES PERFORMANCE VIEWING SYSTEM AND METHOD

PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

Prior to initial examination on the merits, please amend the above-identified application as follows:

IN THE SPECIFICATION:

Please amend the Specification as follows:

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 1, line 2, with the following rewritten paragraph:

--This application is related to, and a continuation of U.S. Application Ser. No. 09/722,050, filed November 27, 2000, which is a continuation-in-part of, U.S. Application Ser. No. 09/524,253, filed March 13, 2000, which is a continuation-in-part of, U.S. Application Ser. No. 09/296,620, filed April 23, 1999, which claims priority from provisional application Ser. No. 60/082,868, filed April 24, 1998, which are incorporated by reference.--

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please cancel claims 1-94 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Please add new claims 95-126 as follows:

--95. (Newly added) A method for measuring the relative accuracy of multiple analysts' estimates at one or more points in time for one or more events, the method comprising the steps of:

generating, for the multiple analysts, a relative accuracy score by comparing the accuracy of an analyst's estimate for an event relative to the average accuracy of the estimates for analysts having estimates for the event; and

generating individual relative accuracy ratings for the multiple analysts.

96. (Newly added) The method of claim 95, wherein the generating step comprises the step of generating a relative accuracy score for each analyst for a given day by providing a numerator that compares an analyst's error on a given day with the average analyst error on that day and providing a denominator that normalizes the numerator.

97. (Newly added) The method of claim 96, wherein the numerator comprises the difference between an analyst's absolute error in an estimate and the average absolute error among a plurality of analysts' estimates.

98. (Newly added) The method of claim 96, wherein the denominator comprises a function of a plurality of values to insure that the relative accuracy rating is normalized in proportion to a plurality of factors to meaningfully compare relative accuracy scores.

99. (Newly added) The method of claim 96, wherein the normalizing step normalizes the relative accuracy score around a neutral value.

100. (Newly added) The method of claim 99, wherein the neutral value corresponds to the average absolute error among a number of analysts.

101. (Newly added) The method of claim 95, comprising the step of aggregating the relative accuracy score for an analyst over more than one day for a single event to generate an analyst event score.

102. (Newly added) The method of claim 101, further comprising the step of, if an analyst does not have an estimate for a given day in the period, assigning a central relative accuracy score for that analyst for that day.

103. (Newly added) The method of claim 101, wherein an event score is capped within a range to enable more meaningful comparison with other event scores.

104. (Newly added) The method of claim 95, wherein the step of measuring an analyst's accuracy for an event further comprises the step of measuring the difference between the analyst's absolute error for an estimate for the event on a day and the average absolute error among all analysts providing estimates on that day for the event.

105. (Newly added) The method of claim 95, wherein the estimate is an earnings estimate.

106. (Newly added) The method of claim 101, wherein the method comprises determining a relative accuracy score for a plurality of analysts for each day over a number of days prior to an event to generate a daily relative accuracy score for the analysts and taking a weighted average of the daily relative accuracy scores for an analyst to generate an aggregated relative accuracy score for the analyst for the event.

107. (Newly added) The method of claim 106, further comprising the step of multiplying the aggregated relative accuracy score for a number of events for an analyst by a function of the number of events.

108. (Newly added) The method of claim 107, wherein the method comprises the step of multiplying the aggregated relative accuracy score less a neutral value by an inflation factor then adding back the neutral value.

109. (Newly added) The method of claim 106, wherein when an estimate is not available or not meaningfully calculable on a given day, replacing that days value with a neutral value.

110. (Newly added) The method of claim 109, wherein the neutral value is a value about which the relative accuracy scores are normalized.

111. (Newly added) The method of claim 107, wherein the weighting is equal for each day.

112. (Newly added) The method of claim 107, wherein the weighting for some days is greater than other days.

113. (Newly added) The method of claim 107, wherein daily relative accuracy scores are only calculated for days for which there are a minimum number of estimates on that day.

114. (Newly added) The method of claim 107, wherein the relative accuracy scores for events are truncated to lie within a predetermined range.

115. (Newly added) The method of claim 95, wherein the method comprises aggregating multiple relative accuracy scores for one event to create an event score.

116. (Newly added) The method of claim 95, wherein the method comprises aggregating multiple relative accuracy scores for one analyst for one security for multiple events.

117. (Newly added) The method of claim 95, comprising a method for aggregating relative accuracy event scores, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting a number (N) of single events for which there are relative accuracy scores to be aggregated;

taking the average (A) of the single event relative accuracy scores over the N events;

taking the difference between the average (A) and a center value for a range;

multiplying the difference (D) by a function f(n); and

adding the center value to the multiplied difference.

118. (Newly added) The method of claim 117, wherein the function f(n) comprises multiplying by a root of N.

119. (Newly added) The method of claim 117, wherein the function f(n) comprises multiplying by the square root of N.

120. (Newly added) The method of claim 96, wherein the denominator is determined by selecting a maximum value from a plurality of values.

121. (Newly added) The method of claim 120, wherein the plurality of values comprises a number based on the standard deviation of analysts' estimates on a day.

122. (Newly added) The method of claim 120, wherein the plurality of values comprises a number based on the average absolute error of analysts on a day.

123. (Newly added) The method of claim 120, wherein the plurality of values comprises a number based on the absolute value of the actual event value.

124. (Newly added) The method of claim 120, wherein the plurality of values comprises a constant monetary value.

125. (Newly added) The method of claim 95, further comprising a step of mapping the relative accuracy scores to an accuracy rating system, wherein an accuracy score that falls within a predetermined range of relative accuracy scores is assigned an accuracy rating corresponding to that range and the accuracy rating has corresponding symbols, where the number of symbols signifies the relative accuracy of an analyst.

126. (Newly added) The method of claim 125, where the ratings range from 1-5 and the symbols comprise stars.--

REMARKS

By this Preliminary Amendment, the Specification has been amended, claims 1-94 have been canceled, and claims 95-126 have been added. Therefore, claims 95-126 are pending.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "**Version With Markings to Show Changes Made**."

Prompt examination and allowance in due course are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY, AND POPEO, PC

By: _____

Bradford C. Blaise
Registration No. 47,429
for James G. Gatto
Registration No. 32,694

Date: October 22, 2001

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY, AND POPEO, PC
One Fountain Square
11911 Freedom Drive
Suite 400
Reston, Virginia 20190
(703) 464-4800 (Telephone)
(703) 464-4895 (Facsimile)

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE SPECIFICATION:

The paragraph beginning at page 1, line 2, has been amended as follows:

This application is related to, and a continuation of U.S. Application Ser. No. 09/722,050, filed November 27, 2000, which is a continuation-in-part of, U.S. Application Ser. No. 09/524,253, filed March 13, 2000, which is a continuation-in-part of, U.S. Application Ser. No. 09/296,620, filed April 23, 1999, which claims priority from provisional application Ser. No. 60/082,868, filed April 24, 1998, which are incorporated by reference.